

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 385 383

PS 023 504

AUTHOR Crowell, Nancy A., Ed.; Leeper, Ethel M., Ed.
TITLE America's Fathers and Public Policy: Report of a Workshop.
INSTITUTION National Academy of Sciences - National Research Council, Washington, DC. Board on Children and Families.
SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 94
NOTE 60p.
AVAILABLE FROM Board on Children and Families, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20418.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Child Support; Disabilities; Early Parenthood; *Family Relationship; *Fathers; Federal Programs; Inner City; Lower Class Parents; Parent Child Relationship; *Parent Role; Program Development; *Public Policy; Social Science Research; Workshops

ABSTRACT

This report reviews the activities of a workshop "America's Fathers: Abiding and Emerging Roles in Family and Economic Support Policies (Washington, D.C., September 26-28, 1993). The workshop focused on the role of fathers in the American family, especially on issues related to child support, teenage fathers, fathers of children with disabilities, and inner-city poor fathers. The workshop sought to: (1) advance understanding of factors that facilitate or inhibit fathers' participation in programs designed to provide support for families; (2) document and integrate what is known about the effects of family and economic support policies on fathers' involvement, or lack thereof, with their children; (3) identify mismatches between the knowledge base and assumptions embedded in both current and proposed public policies; and (4) frame questions for research to better inform family and economic support policies. The report addresses public policy initiatives related to child support enforcement, establishment of paternity, child support assurance, custody, fathers' rights, young fatherhood programs, and teenage fatherhood prevention. It concludes by highlighting the importance of adopting a life-span perspective on fathering, approaching fathering as a negotiated role, considering the community context of fathering, and contributing to the development of innovative programs and policies for fathers. An appendix contains the workshop agenda. (Contains 113 references.) (MDM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 385 383

PS 023504

BOARD ON
**Children and
Families**

America's Fathers and Public Policy

Report of a Workshop

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL
INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. M. Burns

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

America's Fathers and Public Policy

Report of a Workshop

Nancy A. Crowell and Ethel M. Leeper, Editors

Board on Children and Families

Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education
National Research Council

Institute of Medicine

National Academy Press
Washington, D.C. 1994

NOTICE: The project that is the subject of this report was approved by the Governing Board of the National Research Council, whose members are drawn from the councils of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine. The members of the committee responsible for the report were chosen for their special competences and with regard for appropriate balance.

This report has been reviewed by a group other than the authors according to procedures approved by a Report Review Committee consisting of members of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine.

The National Academy of Sciences is a private, nonprofit, self-perpetuating society of distinguished scholars engaged in scientific and engineering research, dedicated to the furtherance of science and technology and to their use for the general welfare. Upon the authority of the charter granted to it by the Congress in 1863, the Academy has a mandate that requires it to advise the federal government on scientific and technical matters. Dr. Bruce M. Alberts is president of the National Academy of Sciences.

The National Academy of Engineering was established in 1964, under the charter of the National Academy of Sciences, as a parallel organization of outstanding engineers. It is autonomous in its administration and in the selection of its members, sharing with the National Academy of Sciences the responsibility for advising the federal government. The National Academy of Engineering also sponsors engineering programs aimed at meeting national needs, encourages education and research, and recognizes the superior achievements of engineers. Dr. Robert M. White is president of the National Academy of Engineering.

The Institute of Medicine was established in 1970 by the National Academy of Sciences to secure the services of eminent members of appropriate professions in the examination of policy matters pertaining to the health of the public. The Institute acts under the responsibility given to the National Academy of Sciences by its congressional charter to be an adviser to the federal government and, upon its own initiative, to identify issues of medical care, research, and education. Dr. Kenneth I. Shine is president of the Institute of Medicine.

The National Research Council was organized by the National Academy of Sciences in 1916 to associate the broad community of science and technology with the Academy's purposes of furthering knowledge and advising the federal government. Functioning in accordance with general policies determined by the Academy, the Council has become the principal operating agency of both the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering in providing services to the government, the public, and the scientific and engineering communities. The Council is administered jointly by both Academies and the Institute of Medicine. Dr. Bruce M. Alberts and Dr. Robert M. White are chairman and vice chairman, respectively, of the National Research Council.

Support for this project was provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, but the Corporation does not take responsibility for any views or statements in this report.

Available from:
Board on Children and Families
Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education
National Research Council
2101 Constitution Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20418

Printed in the United States of America

Copyright 1994 by the National Academy of Sciences. All rights reserved.

BOARD ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

- SHELDON H. WHITE (*Chair*), Department of Psychology, Harvard University
- JACK P. SHONKOFF (*Vice Chair*), Department of Pediatrics, University of Massachusetts Medical School
- JOMILLS H. BRADDOCK, II, Department of Sociology, University of Miami
- LARRY BUMPASS, Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin
- FERNANDO A. GUERRA, Director of Health, San Antonio Metropolitan Health District
- BERNARD GUYER, Department of Maternal and Child Health, Johns Hopkins University
- ALETHA C. HUSTON, Human Development and Family Life, University of Kansas
- ROBERT MICHAEL, Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, University of Chicago
- PAUL NEWACHECK, Institute of Health Policy Studies and Department of Pediatrics, University of California, San Francisco
- JULIUS B. RICHMOND, Department of Social Medicine, Harvard University Medical School
- LISBETH B. SCHORR, Harvard Project on Effective Services, Harvard University
- CAROLE SIMPSON, ABC News, Washington, D.C.
- DEBORAH STIPEK, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles
- DIANA TAYLOR, Women's Health Program, Department of Family Health Care Nursing, University of California, San Francisco
- GAIL WILENSKY, Project Hope, Bethesda, Maryland
- RUTH T. GROSS (*Liaison*), Board on Health Promotion and Disease Prevention, Institute of Medicine
- DEBORAH A. PHILLIPS, *Director*
- NANCY A. CROWELL, *Research Associate*
- DRUSILLA BARNES, *Senior Project Assistant*

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

- ELIJAH ANDERSON, Department of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania
- CHARLES BALLARD, National Institute for Responsible Fatherhood, Cleveland, OH
- ANDREW CHERLIN, Department of Sociology, Johns Hopkins University
- BARBARA CLINTON, Center for Health Services, Vanderbilt University Medical Center
- THOMAS J. DOWNEY, Thomas J. Downey and Associates, Washington, DC
- MARTHA FINEMAN, Columbia University Law School
- JAMES GALLAGHER,* University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- IRWIN GARFINKEL, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University
- JOHN HAGEN, Human Growth and Development, University of Michigan
- TAMARA HAREVEN,* Department of Family Studies and History, University of Delaware
- RON HASKINS, Subcommittee on Human Resources, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC
- MICHAEL KIMMEL, Department of Sociology, University of California at Berkeley
- MARTHA W. KRAUSS, Starr Center for Mental Retardation, Brandeis University
- JOHN KYLE, National League of Cities, Washington, DC
- JAMES LEVINE, Families and Work Institute, New York, NY
- ROBERT LEVY, School of Law, University of Minnesota
- RICHARD MAJORS, Psychology Department, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
- WILLIAM MARSIGLIO, Sociology Department, University of Florida
- JAMES MAY, The Merrywood School, Bellevue, and National Fathers Network, Seattle, WA
- JOHN McADOO, Department of Family and Child Ecology, Michigan State University
- RONALD MINCY,* Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC
- ROBERT MNOOKIN, Program on Negotiation, Harvard Law School
- ROSS PARKE, Psychology Department, University of California at Riverside
- VICKY PHARES, Psychology Department, University of South Florida
- WENDELL PRIMUS, Office of Human Services Policy, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC

JUDITH SELTZER, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison

FREYA SONENSTEIN, The Urban Institute, Washington, DC

ANN TURNBULL, Beach Center on Families and Disability, University of Kansas

DARRYL WARD, Office of Congressman Lucien Blackwell, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC

DONALD WERTLIEB,* Eliot-Pearson Department of Child Study, Tufts University

*Workshop planning group

Acknowledgment

Major support for this activity was provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York through its core funding of the Board on Children and Families and the board's predecessor, the Forum on the Future of Children and Families. Thank you to the members of the forum for initiating this project, which was completed under the auspices of the board. Special thanks to Patricia Place, who oversaw the initial planning activities as director of the National Forum on the Future of Children and Families. In May 1993 the success of the Forum and its many activities led the National Research Council and the Institute of Medicine to establish the Board on Children and Families.

Thank you to all the presenters and participants for their time and contributions. Special thanks goes to the planning group—James Gallagher, Tamara Hareven, Ronald Mincy, and Donald Wertlieb—who gave freely of their time to set the agenda and help select participants, as well as contributing to the meeting. A special note of appreciation is due Donald Wertlieb, chair of the planning group, for his attention and continual assistance in planning and running the workshop. Thanks are also due to Nancy A. Crowell and Ethel M. Leeper for a distillation of the major themes that emerged from the workshop and for their work on this summary report. In addition, much appreciation to Deborah A. Phillips, director of the board, for her insightful input into this report, and to Drusilla Barnes, senior project assistant, for her efforts in organizing the meeting.

Sheldon H. White, *Chair*
Board on Children and Families

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
THE MANY FACES OF FATHERHOOD	5
Economic Support, 6	
Fathers' Investments of Time, 8	
Interactions with Children, 10	
Fathers of Disabled Children, 13	
Summary, 16	
BARRIERS AND INCENTIVES TO INVOLVEMENT	19
Financial and Job-Related Factors, 19	
Role Models and Teenage Fathers, 22	
Influence of Other Relationships, 25	
Summary, 28	
PUBLIC POLICY	30
Federal Policies: Identifying Fathers and Making Them Pay, 31	
Custody Issues and Fathers' Rights, 39	
Young Fathers, 43	
SUGGESTED DIRECTIONS FOR RESEARCH	52
REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY	59
APPENDIX: WORKSHOP AGENDA	67

Introduction

The importance of fathers in children's lives has received growing recognition in recent years. This emphasis has been prompted, in part, by the growing number of families without a father present. More than one million American babies, or 1 in 4, are born each year to unmarried mothers, most of whom are in households without fathers. Estimates are that 55 to 60 percent of all children in the United States will spend some of their childhood in a single-parent household (Hernandez, 1993); that parent is usually the mother. At any given time, about 22 percent of all children under age 18 are living with only one parent. In 1992, only 14 percent of children living in single-parent households lived with their fathers, while 86 percent lived with their mothers (Seltzer, 1993).

Along with the rise in single-parent households has come a persistent rise in child poverty. In 1991, 21 percent of all children under 18 years of age were poor, an increase from 15 percent in 1970 (Bureau of the Census, 1993). Rates of poverty among young children are even higher: 24 percent of all children under 6 years are poor, as are 50 percent of African American and 40 percent of Hispanic children under 6 years (Bureau of the Census, 1993). Children can ill afford the absence of a wage-earning parent. As such, the importance of fathers' economic contribution to the family has never been clearer.

For most children, two parents are better than one for more than just economic reasons. Fathers bring a dimension to child rearing that complements and, under the best of circumstances, supports mothers' roles. For

example, research indicates that the manner in which fathers interact with their children differs from that of mothers and has an important role in children's social and emotional development (Parke, 1990). With more mothers in the work force than ever before, many fathers are assuming a share of routine child care responsibilities. Most describe the experience as extremely rewarding.

Styles of fathering are as different as their roles. Some dads are indulgent, others strict; some are gentle, others rough. Some delight in sharing the daily chores of child rearing; others remain aloof from day-to-day care. And there is a significant and growing number of absent fathers who parent from a distance, if at all.

Although there is great variety among men's fathering styles and involvement, public policy concerns generally center around fathers' economic contributions and responsibilities rather than other benefits fathers can bring to their children. Historically, the U.S. bias toward noninterference in family life except when society bears the costs of inattention has restricted the development of policies aimed at noneconomic aspects of family functioning. Yet policies aimed at economic aspects do have implications for the broad range of family functions. If family policies could be assessed in terms of both intended and unintended consequences for fathers' inclinations to remain involved with their children, it is possible that fathers could more often exert a positive influence on tomorrow's fathers and mothers.

Mindful of the pressing needs of so many of the nation's children, the diversity of fathers, and the proliferation of research on fathers, the Board on Children and Families convened a workshop, "America's Fathers: Abiding and Emerging Roles in Family and Economic Support Policies," held in Washington, D.C., on September 26-28, 1993. Participants were drawn from the research community, government agencies, and service providers (see page v). The main topics of discussion centered around child support, teenage fathers, fathers of disabled children, and inner-city poor fathers (see the Appendix for the workshop agenda).

Participants framed their discussions to respond to the following objectives:

- to advance understanding of factors that facilitate or inhibit fathers' participation in programs designed to provide support for families;
- to document and integrate what is known about the effects of family and economic support policies on fathers' involvement, or lack thereof, with their children;
- to identify mismatches between the knowledge base and assumptions embedded in both current and proposed public policies; and
- to frame questions for research to better inform family and economic support policies.

Because of the focus on policy-relevant topics, some aspects of fathering received little attention at the workshop. Although fathers may have a variety of parental functions—including setting limits, enforcing discipline, maintaining parental authority, teaching, acting as a role model, nurturing, and caretaking—most of these functions were discussed only in passing, if at all. Rather, the discussion centered primarily around the fathers in families that are under stress, for which the government is most likely to intervene: those who are poor, young, have a disabled child, or are absent because of divorce or for other reasons.

This report reflects the workshop discussions, augmented by research findings that were either noted in the discussions or provided as background reading by participants. Programs that are described in the report are ones with which workshop participants were familiar. Program descriptions are provided for illustrative purposes only; no endorsement of any particular program should be inferred.

The Many Faces of Fatherhood

Depictions of fathers in the media and in public policy debates would lead one to believe there are but two types of fathers: the new nurturing father who is as comfortable in the nursery as in the board room and the "deadbeat dad" who gives neither his time nor his financial support to his children. The reality is that most fathers fall somewhere in between these two extremes. Today's fathers show a diversity of life-styles and a broad range of relationships with their children. So diverse are America's fathers that participants in the workshop agreed there is no consensus on what constitutes the proper role for fathers today.

Fathers can be categorized in many ways: biological fathers and step-fathers; resident and nonresident fathers; married and never-married fathers. There are fathers who take an active part in day-to-day child care and those who leave most of the child rearing to mothers. There are nonresident fathers who see their children on a regular basis and those who pay little or no attention to them. There are those who support their children willingly, those who are tardy in support payments, those who are unemployed and cannot provide economic support, and those who are unwilling to support their children. Fathers may act as caretakers and nurturers, as teachers and role models, or as disciplinarians and authority figures. They may or may not play a vital role as part of the parental team, making decisions about child rearing with mothers. This section examines fathers' roles from the standpoint of economic support, father-child interaction, and amount of time devoted to fathering—the aspects of fathering that received most of the attention at the workshop.

ECONOMIC SUPPORT

Whatever his other roles in the family, a father is first and foremost expected to provide economic support. When he fails to do so, society considers him irresponsible, and the government evokes legal procedures to collect payment. If a father fails in other fathering roles, it is assumed that the mother will be there to fill those roles, to look after a child's other needs. But failure as a breadwinner is a mark of not measuring up to a widely accepted standard.

Fathers are, indeed, the principle earners in most intact families. Although 70 percent of U.S. women aged 18 to 50 are employed outside the home, women's wages still trail those of men. In 1992, the median income for working women was 75 percent of the median income for working men. Employed wives had an even lower median income—only 69 percent that of employed husbands (Bureau of the Census, 1993). Because of this disparity, divorce often leads to a precipitous drop in income for women and their children. Children of divorce, on average, experience a 33 percent decline in income during the first year after divorce (Duncan and Hoffman, 1985). If estimates are correct, about one-quarter of children born in the 1980s will experience their parents' divorce and its attendant economic disruption (Seltzer, 1993). Another one-third of children will be born to unmarried women, although approximately one-quarter of them cohabit with the children's fathers.

In 1989, about two-thirds of ever-divorced mothers were granted child support awards requiring nonresident fathers to pay child support (Bureau of the Census, 1991). Among poor divorced mothers, the proportion is smaller—just 43 percent. Only 24 percent of unmarried mothers are granted child support awards (Committee on Ways and Means, 1992). Of the divorced fathers, one-half do not pay the full amount of the award, and one-quarter of them never pay anything. As a consequence, about one-half of divorced mothers receive no formal child support payments from nonresident fathers (Seltzer, 1993). Comparable statistics for unmarried fathers are not available.

Child support awards tend to be low: they typically represent only about 19 percent of the total income of a single mother's household. The average annual payment to those who receive support is about \$3,000 (Bureau of the Census, 1993). Of divorced fathers who do not have court-ordered child support payments, estimates are that one-quarter of them make informal contributions to their children. The median annual amount of these informal contributions is about \$1,200 (J. A. Seltzer, unpublished data). The average annual payment to poor mothers is less than \$1,900 (Bureau of the Census, 1993).

Participants at the workshop pointed out that among poor inner-city families, support from noncustodial fathers is often arranged informally

between the two parents. For those at the bottom of the income scale, income is not only low but often irregular, and so child support payments are also irregular. When a poor father does have money, he may buy food or clothing for his children or make a monetary contribution to their mother.

As time passes after the separation, some fathers begin to waver in their attention to support payments. As men remarry or employment patterns and incomes change, mothers and fathers are likely to negotiate different financial and visiting agreements. Very often this occurs informally, without the expense of lawyers and court fees. Peters et al. (1993) found that 15 to 30 percent of families had made modifications to their child support agreements within 3 years of their divorces. More than 80 percent of the modifications were informal, thus technically out of compliance with the court-ordered agreements. Modifications were primarily due to changes in financial circumstances or custodial arrangements.

FATHERS' INVESTMENTS OF TIME

The perception of fathers as mainly breadwinners persists in the United States. Men themselves view their identity and self-respect as integrally tied to their work (Gaylin, 1992). Yet with the combination of women's more active participation in the work force and the economic recession of the past decade, men may be reevaluating their roles and placing increasing importance on their families and children. The mass media present more and more images of fathers as nurturers. Men increasingly say they want to spend more time with their children. More men now say they want custody of their children. Do their actions match their words?

There is little evidence to suggest that fathers are sharing equally the "second shift" of child care, even in families in which both parents work (Pleck, 1985; Furstenberg, 1988; Hochschild and Machung, 1990). The amount of time spent caring for children by fathers remains substantially less than the time spent by mothers. The 1985-1987 Americans' Use of Time Project found that, on average, mothers spent 9 hours a week doing primary child-care activities, such as feeding, dressing, transporting, or playing with a child, while fathers spent only 3 hours per week (Robinson, 1989). In households with children under age 5, mothers spent 17 hours per week in primary child-care activities, compared with fathers' 5 hours per week. This pattern of time spent in primary child-care activities with children is essentially the same as it has been for the past two decades (Robinson, 1989).

In contrast, more fathers are taking sole responsibility for care of their children, at least for portions of the day. According to a recent report from the Population Reference Bureau (O'Connell, 1993), about 20 percent of preschool children in 1991 were cared for by their fathers—both married

and unmarried—while their mothers worked. Prior to 1988, the share of preschoolers cared for by their fathers had held steady at about 15 percent for many years. The increase may result in part from the continuing recession. In households in which the father has been laid off and the mother continues to work, the cost of out-of-home day care may be prohibitive on a single income. Other parents may deliberately work nonoverlapping schedules to avoid costly out-of-home care (Presser, 1988).

More fathers are also heading single-parent households. According to Census Bureau data for 1992, 14 percent of single-parent homes are now headed by fathers, compared with 10 percent in 1980. More than 4 percent of all children live with a single father. Single fathers have usually been thought of as widowed or divorced, rarely poor, and having custody of older children, usually boys, but a recent study at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (cited in Johnson, 1993) found otherwise: nearly 25 percent of single fathers have never been married, and only 7.5 percent are widowed. About 18 percent of these single-father households are poor (compared with 43 percent of single-mother households). The Wisconsin research also found that 44 percent of the children in single-father households are girls; 33 percent are preschoolers.

A study of families following divorce in California (Maccoby and Mnookin, 1992), however, found nothing to indicate a trend toward father custody. Although a high percentage of the fathers interviewed indicated a preference for some physical custody arrangement other than mother custody, few of them actually sought custody through formal legal means. In only 10 percent of the postdivorce households in their study were children living with the father; in 70 percent of the households, the children resided with the mother. In about 17 percent of the families, there was some sort of dual residence with children spending at least one-third of their time with each parent.

INTERACTIONS WITH CHILDREN

Even though many modern fathers are performing tasks once considered mothers' work, it is wrong to dismiss them as "Mr. Moms," mere substitutes for the "real" caregivers—mothers. Although fathers spend less overall time with their children than do mothers, when they do interact, studies have found that both middle- and working-class fathers are capable of being just as nurturant and involved with their infant as are mothers (Parke, 1990). They touch, look at, vocalize, and kiss their infants as often as mothers. Fathers are also as responsive to infant cues as mothers. The context of interaction between fathers and children differs from that of mothers and children: while mothers spend a great deal of time in caretaking, fathers spend more time in play—particularly physical play—with their young children.

Some evidence suggests that fathers' involvement makes a bigger difference in a child's emotional maturity than in their cognitive development. Young children who play regularly with their fathers seem to get along better with their peers and display greater social confidence. Attempts to understand the "active ingredient" in fathers' play that promotes peer competence have revealed that children learn critical lessons about how to recognize and deal with highly charged emotions in the context of playing with their fathers. Fathers, in effect, give children practice in regulating their own emotions and recognizing others' emotional cues. But this role can be overdone. Fathers who are insensitive to cues of overstimulation from their children, and therefore play too roughly, have children who are intrusive and insensitive with other children (Parke, 1990). These children are likely to be rejected and withdrawn in interactions with their peers.

Age and life experiences also affect men's interactions with their children. As children grow up, fathers spend more time in intellectual and academic pursuits than in physical activities with them (Snarey, 1993). This may be a factor of the increased intellectual capacities of the children and the desire of fathers to prepare their older children to meet the challenges of college and careers. Fathers' decreasing physical stamina with age, along with their older children's increased physical competence, may also play a part in this shift in activities. Workshop participants suggested that older fathers of young children may also be less inclined to physical play. One workshop participant noted that he reads a lot more to his current 3-year-old than he did to his first child when she was 3, 20 years ago.

Perhaps the strongest influence on fathers' time with their children is their marital status. Data on noncustodial visitation by divorced and nonmarried fathers paint a disturbing picture. One national survey found that among children living with their mothers—whether as a result of nonmarital birth or divorce—35 percent never see their fathers, and 24 percent see their fathers less than once a month (Seltzer and Bianchi, 1988; Seltzer et al., 1989). There is growing evidence that both divorced and never-married fathers who pay child support are more likely to visit their children and to be involved in decision making about their children's lives (Seltzer, 1991b; Lerman, 1993), but it is unclear whether involvement with the children encourages payment or payment encourages the desire to be involved. It is also possible that similar demographic or psychological factors result in fathers' both paying child support and spending time with children (Seltzer, 1992).

Research is inconclusive on whether fathers spend more time or spend time differently with their sons than with their daughters. Snarey (1993) found no differences in amount or type of interaction based on the sex of the child, and studies have similarly found no paternal preference for sons or daughters (Belsky et al., 1984; Feldman and Gehring, 1988; Grossman et al., 1988; Russell and Russell, 1987). In contrast, some studies report that

fathers prefer to interact with sons (Barnett and Baruch, 1987; Belsky, 1979; Bronstein, 1988; Lamb, 1977), and others find fathers to be more involved with daughters (Lamb et al., 1988). Snarey suggests some of the differences may be due to the ages of the boys and girls, with fathers preferring sons in infancy and young childhood, but moving toward equal interaction with sons and daughters as the children get older.

FATHERS OF DISABLED CHILDREN

The need for a nurturing father may be especially great in a family with a disabled child. Not only does the child have problems that require sustained parental attention, but the mother and other family members also need extra support to help them manage the physical and emotional stresses. Without doubt, responsive husbands and fathers can ease a demanding situation, yet they are often overlooked by professionals who work with families of disabled children.

When a disabled child is born, parents must deal with many emotions at once: shock, fear, anger, sadness. They may be uncertain about their ability to deliver and pay for the care their child will need. They may be anxious about how the other children in the family will be affected. Arrival of a disabled child contradicts a basic belief held by many Americans that life, for the most part, is benign. Pragmatic concerns, therefore, are often compounded by the disruption of long-held convictions about the kind of life one expected.

Mothers and fathers tend to react differently to the birth of a disabled child. Many fathers prefer action; they want service programs to offer them guidance on how to proceed. Mothers are more likely to look to social services for emotional support. Some fathers seek to augment their income with overtime or a second job in order to meet the added financial needs of a disabled child, but this leaves them with less time for their family and may be perceived as avoidance by mothers.

The success or failure of a family rearing a disabled child very often rests principally on the mother, but her attitude toward her weighty responsibilities is very much colored by her relationship with her husband. If the father's behavior doesn't measure up to mother's expectation of what he should do, she is more likely to report symptoms of depression (Bristol et al., 1988). Yet depression is quite common, particularly among mothers, so it may not distinguish mothers of disabled children. Efforts to compare families with disabled children with matched samples of families without disabled children have found somewhat more depression reported by mothers of a disabled child than by mothers of nondisabled children, but the difference was not very large (Bristol et al., 1988). Mothers in all cases expressed more depression than did fathers.

Researchers have also found that fathers of disabled children provide

significantly less support to mothers and spend less recreational time with their disabled children than do similar fathers of nondisabled children (Gallagher et al., 1984). This may reflect the difficulty of finding physical activities in which the disabled child can participate. Other studies have found that fathers of young children with developmental disabilities have difficulty in forming an emotional attachment to their children (Krauss, 1993). Fathers of disabled children also reported significantly more marital disagreements than did fathers of nondisabled children (Bristol et al., 1988). The nature and degree of the disabling condition appear to play little role in the parents' responses (Krauss, 1993).

Many fathers may want to be more involved with their disabled children but don't know how to begin. One of the workshop participants told of a pediatrician who regularly enlisted the aid of fathers in exercising their child's crippled limbs while assuring the father that he, alone, had the strength to do the job properly. Privately, the physician confessed that he really couldn't be sure the exercise would do any good, but he was convinced that

NATIONAL FATHERS' NETWORK INVOLVING FATHERS OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

The National Fathers' Network, funded by a Special Projects of Regional and National Significance grant from the Maternal and Child Health Bureau and affiliated with the National Center for Family-Centered Care (a program of the Association for the Care of Children's Health), advocates for fathers and families of children with special needs through training, development of mentoring and support programs, curriculum development, and publication of a quarterly newsletter. Current initiatives include investigation of health care for African American fathers and improved supports for rural and inner-city families and for families of children who are HIV positive.

The key component for building inclusive programs for fathers is an attitude and expectation that fathers will want to participate in the care and treatment of their children (May, 1991). If possible, each aspect of the available programs should be structured to involve fathers (or other important male figures) from the very beginning. For instance, flexible scheduling can allow fathers to be involved in treatment sessions. Special activities for men and their children, support groups, and activities for all family members will further assist fathers in being fully engaged with their children and in service delivery.

The National Father's Network has run a demonstration father support program at the Merrywood School in Bellevue, Washington, since 1985. It has helped establish more than 50 such programs

the time the father spent with the child would do them both a world of good.

Regardless of their initial responses, sooner or later parents come to the realization that they will probably have to care for their disabled child throughout their lifetimes: for example, 85 percent of mentally retarded children remain with their families all their lives (Essex et al., 1993). This life-long need for care means that parents of disabled children face continuing responsibility into old age, when they may not be physically able to handle it. Although mothers remain the dominant caregivers, fathers may assume more responsibility for the care of adult sons. The care provided to handicapped sons by fathers is not limited to personal, bodily care such as bathing, but also includes running errands and helping manage finances (Essex et al., 1993). If a mother dies or becomes incapacitated, the father may then assume full care of the disabled child.

Traditionally, programs for families of disabled children have been designed and administered by women and for women—a holdover from the

throughout the United States and Canada. They are designed to give fathers of children with special needs a comfortable place to discuss their personal concerns and issues and also to learn how to better parent their children. The program is built around the expressed needs of the participating fathers: they are asked, "What will make this program valuable for you?" Leadership is provided by the fathers themselves, and they are often assisted by a male professional.

A typical meeting includes social time, sharing and open discussion, periodic father-child activities, and speakers on identified topics of interest. Time for sharing and discussion is a key element of the support program; it provides a safe place for fathers to explore their feelings of joy and sadness, anger and pride. Topics for the educational component often come from these discussions. Social events, most often for the entire family, allow the men to informally meet other fathers of disabled children. Father-child activities provide opportunities for fathers to learn and practice appropriate parenting skills, as well as simply to have fun with their children.

The importance of the fathers program may best be characterized by the words of one of the participants: "The fathers' program provides me with a place to go where I can be emotional, or not; optimistic, or not; happy, or not; angry, or not. In short, a place where I can feel what I need to feel . . . a place to share my [concerns] with others who, at some time or another, have had similar experiences. It is a safe haven from the subtle pressures on men to show that 'everything is fine' " (May, 1992).

days when mothers stayed at home and cared for the children. Because mothers were more accessible than fathers, programs were built around their needs. Even current "family-oriented" programs continue to focus on mothers and describe family needs from their perspectives. Research that guides the design of service programs has also been centered on mothers and therefore largely ignores the role of fathers.

A number of social service programs for families with disabled children are currently reexamining their focus and moving toward greater family empowerment, participants noted. This new approach looks to parents to identify their needs and, with the assistance of professionals, change programs accordingly. (For an example of such a program, see box.) In this new milieu, fathers should not only be welcomed into the process, but encouraged to join their partners in effecting change.

SUMMARY

While the perception of fathers as primarily breadwinners persists in the United States, men may be beginning to reevaluate their roles and to place more importance on other family roles. Although the dramatic shift in fathers' roles that was forecast in the 1970s and early 1980s has not materialized, there have been some changes in attitudes and practice. More fathers today are spending time as primary caretakers of their children, more fathers head single-parent households, and more fathers express interest in having custody of their children after divorce. For all too many U.S. children, however, fathers remain on the periphery of daily family life. Mothers continue to be the parent with primary responsibility for child rearing and the preeminent presence in young children's lives.

When fathers spend time with their children, research has found them as nurturing as mothers, but in slightly different ways. Fathers engage in more physical play with their young children than do mothers. In this context, they appear to make a significant and perhaps unique contribution to children's emotional and social development. While fathers certainly are capable of significantly affecting their children's development, the question remains as to whether they are typically involved enough in the daily rearing of their children to do so. Fathers of disabled children spend even less time playing with their children than do fathers of nondisabled children. Not only may opportunities for physical play be restricted with a disabled child, but the support programs available to families of disabled children tend to focus on mothers, to the neglect of fathers.

An equivocal portrait, therefore, emerges from the evidence regarding whether contemporary fathers are becoming more engaged in family life, either economically or with respect to daily child rearing. An obvious next question concerns the barriers to and incentives for their greater involvement.

Barriers and Incentives to Involvement

A number of factors may influence the degree to which a father is involved with his children. Considerable discussion at the workshop focused on the involvement of nonresident divorced or unmarried fathers. Within these groups, poor fathers received the most attention during the workshop. This focus resulted from the perception that ability to pay often sets the terms and frequency of a nonresident father's involvement with his children, both financial and otherwise. Even among resident fathers, however, there are marked differences in the level of involvement. This section explores some of the barriers and incentives to fathers' involvement with their children.

FINANCIAL AND JOB-RELATED FACTORS

The ability to provide financial support plays a large part in the level of fathers' interactions with their children. McAdoo (1988) has found that fathers who are economically able to provide financial support to their families are more nurturing in their interactions with their children than fathers who cannot provide financial support. Among African American fathers he studied, those who could fulfill their provider role were more likely to be involved in other aspects of child rearing and more likely to have stable families (McAdoo, 1993b).

The emphasis that both society and fathers themselves put on the role of breadwinner can have a negative effect on the involvement of unem-

ployed or poor fathers with their children. Research going all the way back to the Great Depression has shown that when men cannot financially provide for their families, they may leave or limit their involvement with their families (Elder and Caspi, 1988). Ross and Sawhill (1975) estimated that separation rates are twice as high among families in which fathers are unemployed as in families whose fathers experience stable employment. Both longitudinal studies and aggregate data consistently show that unemployment is related to marital instability and growth in female-headed households (Wilson, 1987), which in turn affect fathers' involvement with their children.

Nowhere can the impact of unemployment be seen as clearly as among the inner-city minority poor. In the last two decades, the inner-city industrial base has crumbled; the unemployment rate among black men was 15.2 percent in 1992 (Bureau of the Census, 1993). For young black men the situation is even worse: 24.5 percent of black men aged 20-24 were unemployed in 1992, as were 42 percent of black teenage males. Besides extraordinarily high unemployment rates, young black men also face high rates of incarceration and mortality. About one-fifth of all 16- to 34-year old black males are under justice system supervision. The rates of homicide deaths for blacks are six to seven times higher than those for whites, and homicide is now the leading cause of death among black youths (National Research Council, 1993).

At the same time, single-mother households are on the rise, with 65 percent of African American births being to unmarried women in 1990 (Bureau of the Census, 1993). Hoffman et al. (1992) have attributed about one-half of the decrease in marriage among African American women to the declining labor market prospects of African American men. Most children born to unmarried women are unlikely ever to live with their fathers or to receive support from them (Hawkins, 1992). This combination of factors in the inner city does not bode well for strong father-child involvement.

For employed men, research is beginning to show that the type of employment can have an effect on their interactions with their children, as well as their wives. Men who experience high levels of stress at work tend to withdraw from their wives, denying them support in dealing with the children (Repetti, 1989). These men are also more likely to withdraw from their children than those with less stressful jobs; when they do interact with their children, these fathers are more angry and impatient (Repetti, 1994). Workplace qualities other than stress may also influence father-child interaction. Greenberger and O'Neil (1991) found that men in complex jobs, that is, in jobs in which there is a high degree of challenge and autonomy, tend to devote more time to developing their children's skills, particularly for their sons.

Workplace policies and schedules may interfere with fathers' desire to

be more involved with their children. Gerson (1993) found that most fathers she studied were constrained by rigid work schedules. Paternal leave policies were rare; when they existed, few men took advantage of them, fearing the negative effects on their careers.

ROLE MODELS AND TEENAGE FATHERS

Not only have jobs been lost in the inner cities in the United States, but the social organization of many inner-city communities has also changed. Along with the outmigration of jobs, there has also been a departure of middle- and working-class African Americans (Wilson, 1987). A poor child growing up in the inner city 30 years ago saw examples of intact families and working fathers in the neighborhood, but today those role models are mostly gone. A number of workshop participants talked about these older male role models, or "old heads"—men who worked in the factories, looked after their families, attended church, and obeyed the law (see box). These men held a position of moral authority in the community by dint of their economic roles. They served as models and surrogate fathers, helping young boys make the transition from childhood to manhood.

With the exodus of these old heads from the inner city or their loss of employment and concomitant loss of respect from the younger generation, the social structure of many inner-city neighborhoods has drastically changed. Without the moral guidance of the old heads, many young inner-city males find the allure of the drug trade and gangs hard to resist. Without the role models of the old heads as stable family man, more and more young inner-city black males are becoming unwed fathers. Data from the National Longitudinal Surveys of Labor Market Experience, Youth Cohort (NLSY) suggest that young black men are becoming unwed fathers at rates much higher than young men in other disadvantaged groups. In 1988, nearly one in three young black men was an unmarried father, two to three times the rate for Hispanics, poor whites, Asians, and American Indians (Lerman, 1993).

Teenage fathers are more likely to come from an economically disadvantaged family and to have completed fewer years of schooling than their childless peers (Marsiglio, 1987; Pirog-Good, 1992; Lerman, 1993). Although teenage fathers earn more money than their nonfather counterparts up to age 20, by age 29, those who deferred fatherhood earn roughly 74 percent more than the teenage fathers (Pirog-Good, 1992). Teenage fathers are also more likely than their childless peers to commit and be convicted of illegal activity, and their offenses seem to be of a more serious nature (Pirog-Good, 1992). Given their low educational attainment and low earnings, it is not surprising that absent teenage fathers are less likely to pay

child support than those who fathered children in their 20s. By age 27, less than one-third of absent teenage fathers paid child support, compared with 51 percent of absent fathers who had their children at age 20 or later (Pirog-Good, 1992).

Lacking good economic prospects, young inner-city males may see paternity as a means of earning respect. Marsiglio (1993a) found that economically disadvantaged youth were significantly more likely to agree that "fathering a child would make them feel like a 'real' man." As a workshop participant noted, young men who can't afford to take on the traditional role of breadwinning spouse and father "do the next best thing. They have sex,

OLD HEADS

Elijah Anderson read this excellent description of the role of old heads in the African American inner-city community at the workshop (Anderson, 1992a:69-70):

The relationship between old heads and young boys represents an important institution in the traditional black community. It has always been a central aspect of the social organization . . . assisting the transition of young men from boyhood to manhood, from idle youth to stable employment and participation in the regular manufacturing economy. The old heads acknowledged role was to teach, support, encourage, and in effect socialize young men to meet their responsibilities with regard to the work ethic, family life, the law, and decency. But as meaningful employment has become increasingly scarce, drugs more accessible, and crime a way of life for many young black men, this institution has undergone stress and significant change.

Now the traditional old head was a man of stable means who was strongly committed to family life, to church, and most important, to passing on his philosophy, developed through his own rewarding experience with work, to young boys he found worthy. He personified the work ethic and equated it with value and high standards of morality; in his eyes, a workingman was a good, decent individual. The old head/young boy relationship was essentially one of mentor-protégé. The old head might be only 2 years older than the young boy or as much as 30 or 40 years older; the boy was usually at least 10. The young boy readily deferred to the old head's chronological age and worldly experience. The nature of the relationship was that of junior/senior, based on junior's confidence in the senior's ability to impart useful wisdom and practical advice for getting on in the world and living well.

babies come, [but] they remain at home with their mothers and play the role of father part time and husband part time."

Few young men who father children outside of marriage subsequently marry the mothers of those children and live with them. Almost three-quarters of young fathers who live away from their child at birth never subsequently live in the same household with them (Lerman, 1993). But not living in the same household does not necessarily mean lack of involvement with their children. Lerman's analysis of the NLSY found that nearly 80 percent of unmarried fathers who lived near their children visited them every day or several times a week. Ethnographic work also suggests that

The old head was a kind of guidance counselor and a moral cheerleader who preached anticrime and antitrouble messages to his charges. Encouraging boys to work and to make something of themselves, he would try to set a good example by living, as best he could, a stable, decent, worry-free life. His consistent refrain was "Get yourself a trade, son" or "Do something with your life," or "Make something out of yourself." Displaying initiative, diligence, and pride, as a prime role model of the community, he lived "to have something," usually something material, though an intact nuclear family counted for much in the picture he painted. On the corners and in the alleys of [the community,] he would point to others as examples of how hard work and decency could pay off. He might advise young boys to "pattern yourself after him," [this man who has a family.] In these conversations and lectures, he would express great pride in his own outstanding work record, punctuality, good credit rating, and anything else reflecting his commitment to honesty, independence, hard work, and family values.

The old head could be a minister, a deacon in the church, a local policeman, a favorite teacher, an athletic coach, or a street corner man. He could be the uncle or even the father of a member of the local group of young boys. Very often the old head acted as surrogate father for those he considered in need of his attention. A youth in trouble would sometimes discuss his problem with an old head before going to his own father, if he had one, and the old head would be ready with a helping hand, sometimes a loan for a worthy purpose. . . . Through this kind of extension of himself, the old head gained moral affirmation that would be his reward, an important if subtle incentive for helping other young boys.

Reprinted with permission.

inner-city young black males usually acknowledge their paternity and that the community supports the young father's participation in informal child support arrangements (Anderson, 1992b; Sullivan, 1985).

INFLUENCE OF OTHER RELATIONSHIPS

One theme that was articulated throughout the workshop was the effect of a father's relationships with the other adults in his children's lives on his involvement with his children. Even in intact families, the roles played by mothers and fathers are negotiated by the couple. Some research in two-parent families has shown that, after controlling for men's attitudes, the major factor in the amount of a father's involvement is the mother's attitude toward the father's ability to provide child care (Hochschild and Machung, 1990; Beitel and Parke, 1993). Cowan and Cowan (1992) found that even among couples who had planned on equal parenting responsibilities prior to the birth of their first child, the major responsibility very quickly fell on the mother. Most of the mothers in the study were disappointed by their husbands' lack of involvement. A few of the full-time mothers, however, may be threatened by the fathers' involvement with the child. As one of their female subjects asked: "If John does well at his work and his relationship with the baby, what's my special contribution?" (Cowan and Cowan, 1992:103). Several participants cautioned that this discussion sounded like mother blaming. One participant noted of her work with poor, rural families "fathers don't get involved in these programs largely because they undervalue and devalue the parenting role. So we are very hesitant to blame the mothers for that when the mothers have filled the vacuum, so to speak."

Following separation or divorce, the history and nature of the relationship between the mother and the father may have a large impact on the amount of father-child interaction. Children are still more likely to live with their mothers than their fathers following divorce, so that mothers' control over children increases dramatically after divorce (Seltzer, 1993). A mother may either encourage or discourage father-child interaction. One participant noted that a mother may limit a father's access to children to put pressure on him to increase child support payments or that a mother may not be comfortable with the father's child rearing practices. In light of the growing number of reported cases of child physical and sexual abuse, some mothers may limit fathers' access in order to protect the children. The participant went on to describe mothers' anxiety about losing custody of their children: "Because men control more economic and social resources, I think women are understandably anxious about relinquishing control over their children. By facilitating fathers' independent involvement with the children, mothers are at risk to losing their children because men have greater resources and greater relative power." In contrast to this view,

Maccoby and Mnookin (1992) note that a mother's conviction that it is good for her child to have contact with the father is strongly associated with sustaining contact after divorce.

In births to unmarried teenage mothers, a father's involvement with his child may be influenced not only by his relationship with the child's mother, but also by his relationship with her mother or his mother. The mother and maternal grandmother may limit the father's access if he cannot help support the child. One workshop participant described this as the "if you can't pay, you can't play [house]" scenario. Hernandez (1993) reports that nearly one-fifth of children living with never-married mothers are in the household with a grandparent, who may have notable influence. The paternal grandmother also can play a role in encouraging or discouraging the young man's involvement. If she likes the mother and is convinced her son is the father, she may encourage marriage or at least child support; if she thinks her son is not the father, she may discourage him from involvement (Anderson, 1992a). A workshop participant who works with young inner-city fathers noted that his program now includes sessions with the grandparents because of the role they play in helping or hindering father-child involvement and in discouraging further pregnancies outside of marriage.

Professionals who work with families may also play a role in keeping fathers at a distance. As was noted above regarding fathers of disabled children, services to families in need are often geared to mothers, and service providers are usually women. These factors can make fathers uncomfortable about participating in service programs. The attitudes of service providers toward fathers may also keep fathers away, a participant noted. Another workshop participant told of his experiences working in a hospital clinic for mothers and babies: "What depressed me was seeing so many mothers and babies with no fathers around. Fathers would be sitting in the parking lot or they'd be in other parts of the hospital." After tracking these fathers down and talking to them, he discovered "they were intimidated by the doctors and nurses and social workers—not necessarily by what they said to them, but [by] their behavior when these fathers came to the clinic." Research by Wattenberg (1987) tends to confirm these perceptions. She found that social service and hospital programs for young, unmarried mothers tend to reinforce the mothers' autonomy from the fathers. Furthermore, they provide little or no information to these young mothers on the benefits of establishing paternity or on how to go about doing it.

SUMMARY

Many economic and social barriers contribute to fathers' noninvolvement with their children. The prominence in our society of the father as breadwinner leaves men who cannot financially support their children feel-

ing as if they are bad fathers and may lead to their avoiding their children and families. Unemployment, which has been shown to be related to marital instability and to the growth in female-headed households, has taken its toll, particularly on the inner-city minority poor. The high rate of births to unmarried women in inner cities has been partly attributed by some to lack of employment prospects for young men. The loss of jobs in the inner city has also led to a loss of male mentors and positive role models for young men.

For employed men, workplace policies frequently do not allow them the flexibility to spend more time with their children. Even in companies that have paternal leave policies, many men do not feel free to avail themselves of the leave. Workplace environments may also have an effect on men's interactions with their children: fathers who work under high levels of stress tend to be more angry and impatient with their children.

Attitudes of other adults towards fathers' involvement also play a part in the role a father takes. In two-parent families, a major factor in the amount of a father's involvement, after controlling for men's attitudes, is the mother's attitude toward the father's role. The attitudes of grandparents may also have an influence on a father's interactions with his children. Professionals who aim services primarily at mothers and children also serve to keep fathers at bay. Service programs that use family-centered models may encourage fathers' involvement.

Public Policy

Much of the workshop discussion about policy centered around noncustodial fathers and their economic responsibilities. Absent fathers have become the target of concentrated attention from federal, state, and local governments, working on the assumption that if fathers paid their fair share of support for their families, welfare costs could be reduced. A significant amount of federal and state funds currently is expended for establishing the paternity of children born to unmarried women. Issues surrounding child custody following divorce were also discussed at some length, as was preventing teenage males from becoming fathers in the first place. An area generally untouched by public policy is that of encouraging unmarried or divorced fathers to maintain a link with their children, even when financial support is unlikely.

Although most discussion focused on federal- and state-level policies, one participant reminded the workshop that many county- and local-level policies also affect fathers and families. Public health departments, parks and recreation departments, public works departments, transportation and housing strategies, and local economic development plans all play a part in lives of fathers and their families.

Throughout the discussion there was a pervasive recognition of the broader policy context in which these issues need to be considered. A central aspect of this context concerns the national reluctance to intervene in family matters, except when society bears the costs of noninvolvement—as in the case of welfare, foster care, and public health. The workshop

participants were not suggesting a shift toward more government intervention in families, but rather that the implications of the economically oriented policies for fathers' economic and noneconomic contributions to their families should be considered when policies are assessed. There was also a tension between those workshop participants who stressed the importance of the declining economic and educational infrastructure faced by many of today's fathers and those who stressed the responsibility of individual fathers to fulfill their familial obligations.

FEDERAL POLICIES: IDENTIFYING FATHERS AND MAKING THEM PAY

The federal government became involved in child support enforcement primarily as a means to defray growing welfare costs. Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the core of a complex of programs designed to benefit poor families, was created by the Social Security Act of 1935 to give assistance to children in one-parent homes. AFDC traditionally has been, and still is, primarily an assistance program for single mothers. When the program started in 1935, 88 percent of recipients were widows with dependent children. Now more than 50 percent of recipients are never-married mothers and their children.

Until the 1960s, families that were in need because fathers were unemployed were not eligible for AFDC. Now, under the Family Support Act of 1988, all states must offer assistance to two-parent families if the primary breadwinner becomes unemployed or works fewer than 100 hours a month; however, 13 states place time limits on the length of time that two-parent families can receive aid. Only 7 percent of the nearly 5 million families on welfare in 1993 were two-parent families (Congressional Research Service, 1993c).

With the growth of families headed by never-married or divorced mothers receiving welfare, attention has turned to the role of absent fathers in providing financial support. Although some people argue that many fathers of children on AFDC have low or no wages, making their financial contribution unlikely to raise their children out of poverty (Hernandez, 1993), the prospect of reducing welfare payments has involved the government in child support enforcement.

Child Support Enforcement

As noted above, many fathers do not pay child support even when they have been ordered by the courts to do so. The Social Security Act of 1975 made the federal government a party in efforts to collect support from noncustodial fathers. This act set up the Child Support Enforcement (CSE)

program, which seeks to establish paternity for children born outside of marriage in order to collect support for these children, as well as for children of formerly married partners. The program was originally designed to serve only families receiving welfare assistance, but in 1981 its services were offered on a fee basis to other custodial parents seeking support from their children's fathers (or, in rare cases, mothers). Currently, all 50 states and the District of Columbia operate CSE programs, to which the federal government contributes 66 percent toward administrative costs plus incentive payments to the states. The federal government also reimburses state and local programs for 90 percent of the costs of genetic testing to establish paternity.

CSE programs locate fathers, arrange to establish paternity, handle the procedures for obtaining child support awards, and collect payments. Beginning in November 1990, the law mandated immediate withholding from wages of child support orders issued or modified on behalf of AFDC children and non-AFDC children whose parents apply to the state CSE program for services. As of January 1, 1994, immediate withholding from wages of child support is required for all children (Congressional Research Service, 1993c). In 1991, CSE programs collected child support in 12 percent of AFDC cases and 29 percent of non-AFDC cases (Bureau of the Census, 1993).

All AFDC recipients and applicants for welfare must assign their child support rights to the state. When support payments are made, the AFDC recipient receives up to \$50 a month and the remainder goes to federal and state governments as reimbursement for welfare. Critics point out that this system may establish a disincentive for unmarried fathers to cooperate. As one participant put it: "Policy is constraining the direct contributions of these young men to their families." Results of focus groups with noncustodial fathers from low-income neighborhoods also point to the \$50 AFDC pass-through as a disincentive: many of the fathers preferred giving money or material items directly to their children. Furthermore, these men did not understand the child support system. Many of them were under the impression that their entire support payment went to the government and that none actually went to their children (Furstenberg et al., 1992). Those who had wages withheld for support payments were astonished that child support enforcement could work that way. At the extreme, ethnographic work by Anderson (1992b) suggests that withholding wages to cover child support may be a disincentive for working, particularly for a young man who has fathered more than one child outside of marriage. Conversely, a pilot survey of absent parents by Sonenstein and Calhoun (1990) found that withholding wages increased payment levels.

The program is costly for U.S. taxpayers. According to calculations reported by the Congressional Research Service (1993b), federal contribu-

tions to CSE programs totaled \$1.2 billion in fiscal 1991, and the states spent an additional \$592 million to run CSE programs. However, after the state's share of the collections plus federal contributions to administrative costs and incentives, the states netted \$384 million. The federal government, however, spent \$588 million more than it took in. Simple subtraction of the states' positive balance from the federal government's negative balance leaves a net cost to U.S. taxpayers of \$204 million. Some participants pointed out that the growth in cost in CSE programs was due to non-AFDC cases, for which the state may charge no more than a \$25 fee.

Establishment of Paternity

Before a court order for child support can be issued, the unmarried father must legally acknowledge that he is the father of the child. This can be an important step in a child's well-being as it is also the gateway to other benefits, such as coverage by the father's health insurance. Proof of paternity can now be established relatively easily and accurately by genetic testing, and many local jurisdictions now operate laboratories for performing such tests. Yet, it is estimated that paternity is established in only about one-third of nonmarital births (Wattenberg, 1987).

A barrier to paternity establishment is lack of information on what constitutes legal paternity establishment and on what it means. Sullivan (1992) found that many noncustodial fathers wrongly assumed they had established paternity because they were at the hospital when the babies were born and their names were on the birth certificates. Others became more interested in establishing legal paternity when they understood the benefits that could accrue to their children.

In the past few years the federal government has put increasing pressure on state governments to strengthen their programs for establishing paternity and obtaining child support. The Family Support Act of 1988 (P.L. 100-485) set a standard for states to establish paternity for 50 percent or more of the AFDC children born outside of marriage by the beginning of fiscal 1992 or (for states that could not reach this level) to increase their rates by 3 percent a year until they attained 50 percent or the mean percentage of all states. The law also required states to use genetic testing to decide contested cases if one of the parties requested it, authorized federal reimbursement of 90 percent of the costs of genetic testing, and required installation of automated data processing and information retrieval systems. In the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (P.L. 103-66), Congress raised the standard to 75 percent and called for incremental increases of 3 to 6 percent a year until that level is reached. It also required states to make available a civil procedure for voluntary acknowledgement of paternity and to establish hospital-based programs for paternity establishment.

State performance has been mixed. Paternity establishment rates vary from state to state and from county to county. For example, in 1991, West Virginia reported an 88 percent rate of establishing paternity, with Maryland and Iowa following at 78 percent and 75 percent, respectively. In contrast, the rate for Wisconsin was 7 percent; for New Jersey, 8 percent; and for the District of Columbia, 3 percent. During 1991, paternity was established for 479,066 children, an increase of 22 percent over the previous year and a 78 percent increase over 1987 (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1993). The reported percentages include older children as well as infants.

With the wide fluctuations in paternity establishment rates, there is a great deal of interest in methods that work. A survey by the Urban Institute (Sonenstein et al., 1993) found that counties that devoted more resources to child support enforcement had better performance. Programmatic practices also made a difference and could somewhat compensate for lower program resources. Paternity rates rose an average of 37 points in counties that first allowed fathers to acknowledge paternity of their free will, then, if the fathers contested the issue, quickly transferred the case to a prosecuting attorney (Sonenstein, 1993). Other program practices that were associated with higher paternity rates were running routine checks on criminal and school records to locate fathers, paying for genetic screening rather than seeking paternal reimbursement, using computerized forms, and maintaining the county child support program in the same agency at state and local levels.

One participant reported that some members of Congress would like to put more pressure on unmarried mothers applying for AFDC by refusing them welfare benefits until they identify the fathers of their children, withholding full benefits until paternity is established, and terminating all benefits if the mother gives a false name. Another participant argued that this type of measure would be ineffective as most young women do name the father (Sonenstein et al., 1993); the difficulties often arise in locating them or in their ability to pay, once located. Some research suggests that educating young mothers and fathers about the nature of legally establishing paternity and about its benefits for their children may provide incentives for them to do so (Wattenberg, 1987). Other congressional proposals include requiring a minor mother to live at her parent's home, allowing states to refuse AFDC to families in which paternity has not been established, and allowing states to refuse AFDC to families in which either parent is under 18 years of age.

Child Support Assurance

The poor record of child support that actually gets paid has led two

national commissions and some policy makers to propose establishing a child support assurance program. A number of the workshop participants also advocated some form of guaranteed child support benefits.

The major components of a child support assurance system are a uniform child support guideline based on a percentage of the noncustodial parent's income, collection of child support through income withholding, and a minimum assured child support benefit. The first two elements of such a system—the percentage standard and income withholding—were implemented in Wisconsin in 1987. The Family Support Act of 1988 makes these two elements part of every state's child support enforcement system in 1994. The minimum assured child support benefit, under which the federal or a state government would supplement child support payments when necessary to bring them up to the minimum benefit level, has not been tried. The U.S. General Accounting Office (1993) notes that without the minimum assured benefit, a child support assurance system may not meet one of its goals—reduction in child poverty.

Garfinkel et al. (1992) modeled the effects of the Wisconsin program under several scenarios. Under a condition of "medium" improvement in the child support awards and collection without a minimum assured benefit, custodial parents would receive a net increase in income regardless of race, although white families benefitted the most. The addition of a \$2,000 assured benefit improved all custodial families' incomes even more, with the biggest improvement over the no assured benefit situation in black families. Garfinkel and McLanahan (1986) estimated that if the government could collect 70 percent of the support payments due using the Wisconsin percentage of income guidelines, a minimum assured benefit could be offered that would reduce AFDC caseloads by one-half and reduce poverty among children eligible for support by 40 percent, at no additional cost.

In 1992, the House Committee on Ways and Means held hearings on one such proposal, the "Child Support Enforcement and Assurance Act," by former Representative Thomas Downey (D-NY) and Representative Henry Hyde (R-IL). Among other things, this proposal required the federal government to guarantee a minimum level of income support for children whose parents have support orders but fail to pay. In addition, the federal government would assume responsibility for collecting child support payments, primarily through wage withholding. Eligibility for this program would not be limited to low-income families. The bill was not passed.

One workshop participant suggested that what was needed was more than child support assurance. She advocated the idea of a social subsidy for the caretaking function of families through a family wage, saying: "We as a society have to reorient ourselves toward caring for America's children, for all of our children."

CUSTODY ISSUES AND FATHERS' RIGHTS

Custody laws have changed over the years from a presumption (until the late nineteenth century) in favor of fathers because of their provision of financial support, to a presumption in favor of mothers because of their primary caretaker role, to the current "best interest of the child" laws. During the 1970s, a combination of pressure from women's rights groups seeking legal equality and pressure from fathers' rights groups complaining of unfair treatment in custody led to the removal of gender preferences in state custody laws (Fineman and Opie, 1987; Fineman, 1989, 1992). In fact, most state statutes today specifically forbid consideration of the parents' gender in custody cases (Fineman and Opie, 1987), with some states even mandating joint legal custody in most cases. Fineman (1988, 1989, 1992) argues that given the reality of economic inequality between men and women, so-called gender neutrality really amounts to devaluing of the nurturing role and favoring the father for economic reasons (Fineman and Opie, 1987:120-121):

What may have started out as a system which, focusing on the child's need for care, gave women a preference *solely* because they had usually been the child's primary caretaker, is evolving into a system which, by devaluing the content or necessity of such care, gives men more than an equal chance to gain the custody of their children after divorce if they choose to have it, because biologically equal parents are considered as equal in expressive regards. Nonnurturing factors assume importance which often favor men. For example, men are normally in a financially better position to provide for children without the necessity of child support transfers or the costs of starting a new job that burden many women.

Weitzman (1985) found that men succeeded in obtaining custody in 63 percent of negotiated cases when they pursued custody. In contrast, Maccoby and Mnookin (1992) found that when mothers and fathers disagreed about physical custody, mothers' preferences were granted twice as often as fathers' preferences.

Despite the widespread adoption of gender-neutral laws, physical custody is still awarded primarily to mothers. In a study in Wisconsin, Seltzer (1990) found that mothers were granted physical custody in more than 88 percent of cases. Maccoby and Mnookin (1992) found that mothers had physical custody in 70 percent of the California cases they studied, fathers had physical custody in less than 10 percent of the cases, and joint physical custody was granted in about 20 percent. One participant pointed out that research (Singer and Reynolds, 1988; Maccoby and Mnookin, 1992) is finding a disturbing trend towards the use of joint custody as a compromise in the most conflicted situations. These are the couples least likely to be able to work out a cooperative coparenting relationship (Maccoby and Mnookin,

1992). Children who are exposed to continuing parental conflict have been found to suffer adverse consequences, such as depression, deviant behavior, and other symptoms of maladjustment (Buchanan et al., 1991; Johnston et al., 1985).

While children may be living with mothers, fathers are being granted joint decision-making powers (legal custody) in many cases. The California study found joint legal custody decisions in 79 percent of cases. Joint legal custody was granted even in 32 percent of cases in which mothers requested sole legal custody and fathers did not contest the request. In the Wisconsin study, joint legal custody was granted in only 20 percent of cases, with the mother receiving legal custody in nearly 75 percent of cases. Interestingly, in the Maccoby and Mnookin (1992) study, a joint legal custody outcome was more likely when attorneys were involved with one or both of the parents than when no attorneys were involved.

Another issue, although not discussed in detail at the meeting, concerns custody and visitation rights of never-married fathers. One participant noted that 30 years ago, unwed fathers had few if any rights concerning their offspring: for example, they had no standing to prevent an adoption. Due to statutory changes and several Supreme Court decisions, unmarried fathers today do have more legal rights.

While the public perception may be that there is a great deal of legal conflict in the process of establishing child support and child custody decrees, research shows otherwise. More than 50 percent of the cases studied by Maccoby and Mnookin (1992) resulted in uncontested settlements. Only about 4 percent of the cases actually went to trial, and more than 50 percent of those were settled during the trial without the judge having to issue a decree. The amount of conflict according to parents' own ratings was also quite low: only 10 percent of the cases reported very high levels of conflict. Overall, Maccoby and Mnookin concluded that a significant amount of conflict existed in about 25 percent of the divorcing families they studied.

Mediation has been one response to settling divorce-related conflict, and some states have passed mandatory divorce mediation laws. The Family Support Act of 1988 set up demonstration programs to ensure fathers' visitation rights, a number of which included mandatory mediation. While the idea of a neutral mediator helping parents learn to communicate and amicably work out their divorce settlement was appealing to many of the workshop participants, several of those most closely involved in family law urged caution in applying mandatory mediation. One participant noted that many complaints are being raised about adverse results of mandatory mediation, especially on abused spouses, and he noted that some states have excluded abused spouses from the mandatory mediation process. However, he stressed: "I am personally convinced that mediation always produces a

result which is satisfactory to the more dominant partner, because that's the institutional result of a profession committed to resolution and not to the right result."

Another participant raised concerns about the neutrality of mediators: although they may be impartial with respect to fathers and mothers, they have a professional bias in favor of shared parenting, which is clearly evident in the mediation literature. This may be particularly problematic in cases of mandatory mediation, when the mediators are associated with the court. If one parent opposes shared parenting, he or she may be seen as uncooperative by the mediator. These same mediators are in a position to make recommendations to the court about custody in the cases for which mediation fails. Many participants agreed that if mediation is going to be made mandatory, the mediators should not be in a position to make recommendations to the court. In some instances, it was pointed out, mandatory mediation is more *pro forma* than substantive. When only one or two sessions are required, mediation may become just another hurdle to overcome in the divorce process, adding costs without real benefits.

Some participants indicated that mediation has uses beyond divorce and custody. For example, the Parents' Fair Share Demonstration (see box) uses mediation to help unmarried fathers resolve conflicts with the mothers of their children, with the goal of increasing the fathers' desire to support their children, financially and in other ways (Furstenberg et al., 1992).

YOUNG FATHERS

Although much public attention has been given to the growing number of births to unmarried women and to teenage pregnancy, it is only recently that attention has focused on teenage and other young fathers. A large part of the workshop was devoted to the discussion of involving young unmarried fathers in their children's lives. Since not all children born to teenage mothers have teenage fathers, much of the discussion included young men in their 20s as well as teenage males.

Young men who father children while in their teens are less likely than other absent fathers to provide child support. Pirog-Good (1992) found that, even by age 27, only 30 percent of absent teenage fathers paid child support, compared with 51 percent of those who fathered a child at age 20 or later. In addition, the teenage fathers who provided child support paid less than those who had deferred fatherhood.

In a 1992 survey of Child Support Enforcement programs in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, Pirog-Good (1992) found great variety in the treatment of teenage fathers. More than three-quarters of the states attempt to pursue paternity cases regardless of the age of the putative father; 9 states reported deferring paternity establishment in cases where the

PARENTS' FAIR SHARE

The Parents' Fair Share is a pilot program, authorized by the Family Support Act of 1988, with the goal of increasing the ability of noncustodial parents of children on AFDC to pay child support and of increasing child support collections. The Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) developed the model for Parents' Fair Share through focus group interviews with low-income, noncustodial fathers and with poor mothers, in addition to interviews with professionals, such as family court judges, employment services providers, and researchers. Based on the MDRC research, four key components for the Parents' Fair Share program were identified: (1) occupational training and job search and placement services, emphasizing on-the-job training rather than classroom training; (2) enhanced child support enforcement; (3) mediation services to help mothers and fathers overcome disagreements that interfere with child support compliance; and (4) peer support and parenting instruction.

Nine sites—Mobile, Alabama; Jacksonville, Florida; Springfield, Massachusetts; Grand Rapids, Michigan; suburban Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota; Kansas City, Missouri; Trenton, New Jersey; Montgomery and Butler counties, Ohio; and Memphis, Tennessee—were selected to pilot test the Parents' Fair Share model during 1992 and 1993. While each of the nine sites was given a great deal of flexibility in setting up services, they all incorporated the four key components of the model. In addition to the key components, sites were encouraged to recruit noncustodial fathers who had not yet established paternity, as well as those who were not complying with existing child support orders. Sites were also encouraged to establish links between the various agencies to be involved, such as child support, judicial, job training, and welfare. Funding for Parents' Fair Share came from a consortium of federal and state agencies and private foundations.

Evaluation of the first two years of the program has been encouraging (Bloom and Sherwood, 1994). About two-thirds of participants referred to the program actually participated in an employment and training or peer support activity. Most of the fathers who did not participate either found work on their own or were referred back to the courts. Prior to referral, more than 90 percent of these noncustodial fathers had not been engaged in employment or training activities. Parents' Fair Share also helped change the attitudes of many of these men through peer support activities, increasing their desire to be involved with and support their children. MDRC is planning a second phase of the program to examine the longer term effects on participants.

purported father was considered to be too young (under 18 in some states; under 16 in some states; on a case-by-case basis in some states); only 11 states offer programs for teenage fathers through the CSE offices, mostly educational programs about the rights and responsibilities of fatherhood. A few state CSE offices work directly with teenage fathers. In Tennessee, for example, the Responsible Teen Parent Program refers teenage parents in need of employment to Job Training Partnership Act opportunities; however, success is reported to be minimal (Pirog-Good, 1992).

Programs to Increase Involvement

A number of programs aimed at encouraging the involvement of young fathers with their children have been developed in recent years, several of which were discussed at the workshop. Some of these programs are aimed primarily at improving the educational, parenting, and job skills of young fathers to allow them to better support and interact with their children. Many participants expressed the opinion that young fathers want to take a more active part in their children's lives. One participant indicated that evaluations of demonstration projects by Public/Private Ventures and Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation show that "while lots of these young men walk through the door looking for jobs, the thing that keeps them there is the potential to link with their families." Some programs try to capitalize on the desire for involvement, dealing with individual responsibility and self-improvement rather than job training. The following programs were discussed at the workshop. They are included as examples of the types of programs being tried around the country; none has been subjected to vigorous evaluation.

The Teen Alternative Parenting Program

Because most teenage fathers are still in school or in low-paying jobs, it may be difficult for them to provide financial support. Some CSE programs are experimenting with in-kind contributions to offset child support. The CSE unit of Marion County, Indiana, set up one such program in 1986, the Teen Alternative Parenting Program (TAPP). TAPP offered young fathers the chance to earn credits against their child support obligations by engaging in regular visitation, parenting classes, schooling, and job training. It was hoped that this program would encourage young fathers to make child support payments in the future by strengthening the bond with their children and enhancing their job preparedness.

Evaluation of the first 2 years of the program were somewhat discouraging. Data were collected for the 63 fathers offered the TAPP option and for a matched comparison group of 63 nonparticipants. Only one-half of

the young men who were offered the option of participating in TAPP did so (Pirog-Good, 1993); the most common way of earning credit was visitation. The percentage of child support paid by TAPP participants (including their in-kind credits) and by the control group was nearly the same. Pirog-Good concluded that it was too early to determine if TAPP will result any long-range improvements in compliance. The program continues with slight modifications under the name "On Track."

National Institute for Responsible Fatherhood and Family Development

In 1982, workshop participant Charles Ballard of the National Institute for Responsible Fatherhood in Cleveland, Ohio, established the Teen Father Program to reach out to young men in inner-city neighborhoods. Using what he described as a nontraditional outreach and counseling approach, which has some similarities to cognitive therapy and to visualization techniques, the program seeks to change the way these young men think about themselves and their environment, to help them "recreate their dreams." Young fathers are recruited in the places they gather—on the basketball courts, on buses, in clinics, in juvenile court. After 12 years, 85 percent of the participants now are referred by other young men. Services are brought to the homes of the young fathers rather than making them come to the potentially alienating environment of a clinic or office building. The staff, who are called sages, try in some measure to recreate the roles of "old heads" (see above) and to act as role models for the young men.

A survey of 78 young men who had participated in the program between 1984 and 1992 (Nixon and King, 1993) found a number of positive outcomes. Before entering the program, 74 percent of the young men were unemployed; at the time of evaluation, 62 percent were employed full-time and 12 percent were employed part-time, in spite of no direct job training or job search component in the program. Only 14 percent of the young fathers had completed high school upon entering the program; by the time they completed the program, 39 percent had finished high school and at follow-up 70 percent had their high school diploma or General Equivalency Diploma. The program also had positive effects on these young men's relationships with their child and the child's mother. By the end of the program, 84 percent had legally admitted paternity, compared with less than 8 percent before the program. Although 97 percent of the young men said the program had influenced them to provide financial support for their children, no data was given on how many actually followed through; 70 percent of the former clients reported providing financial support for three or more people in 1991. Ninety-six percent of the young fathers reported improved relations with their children's mothers as a result of the program.

These results seem promising in light of the fact that the population served by the National Institute for Responsible Fatherhood is at very high risk of failure on all fronts. Mr. Ballard reported that most of the young men were drug users and in gangs at the time of entry into the program.

Young Unwed Fathers Project

During 1992 and 1993, Public/Private Ventures, Inc., ran a pilot program in six cities—Cleveland, Philadelphia, St. Petersburg, Racine, Fresno, and Annapolis—offering young unwed fathers job training through programs funded by the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), education, fatherhood development activities to encourage establishing paternity and regular payment of child support, counseling, and continued service after job placement. The goal of the project was to determine which service delivery approaches best met the needs of this difficult-to-serve population.

Evaluation of the program sites after the first year (Watson, 1992) found that recruiting the young men was difficult and resource intensive. By the end of the first year (February 1992) only one site had recruited the target of 50 participants. Agencies or staff with good credibility among the population or a reputation for generating good jobs facilitated recruitment, but developing that credibility takes time.

Similar to findings about young fathers in the National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Force Behavior of Youth (see Lerman, 1993), the 228 young fathers enrolled in the first year of the Young Unwed Fathers Project were predominantly African American, had educational deficiencies, and came from poor economic circumstances. Watson (1992) found that these young men want to support and be involved with their children. While only one-third of them had child support orders, nearly one-half of the fathers said they gave some money directly to the mother or person caring for their child. Program staff credit the focus on fatherhood for the project's initial retention rate of 81 percent.

Coordinating services and finding jobs for young unwed fathers proved difficult. Very stringent eligibility rules for JTPA programs disqualified many of the young men. Strict enforcement of child support orders caused some young men to leave training programs and take low paying jobs in order to comply. Watson (1992) concluded that the combination of JTPA and CSE regulations and the lack of coordination between public agencies and programs for young fathers and between JTPA and CSE present serious barriers to both enrollment and service delivery.

Preventing Teenage Fatherhood

Most of the workshop discussion dealt with young men after they had

become fathers, but some participants pointed out that people also need to be concerned with preventing teenage males from fathering children. Most efforts continue to put the onus of pregnancy prevention on young women. The National Research Council study (1987:4) on adolescent pregnancy recommended focusing more attention on young men: "Our concept of the high-risk population must include boys. Their attitudes, motivations, and behavior are as central to the problems as those of their female partners, and they must also be central to the solutions." Yet, it is also important to recognize that many of the fathers of children born to teenage mothers are not teenagers; programs may therefore need to be targeted not just at teenage males.

Sonenstein et al. (1992) studied factors associated with pregnancy risk among adolescent males as measured by frequency of unprotected intercourse. They found that the pregnancy risk was higher, particularly for blacks, among adolescents living in areas of high unemployment. Three other factors that were identified as associated with pregnancy risk among adolescent males were (1) having a mother who had been a teenage parent, (2) believing that premarital sex is acceptable behavior, and (3) having an employed mother. Although much remains to be learned about adolescent males' attitudes and behaviors, the factors Sonenstein et al. found to be associated with higher pregnancy risk may help in designing programs for young men.

SUMMARY

The major foci of the policy discussions at the workshop were on federal-level policy, primarily child support enforcement and the establishment of paternity. There was also discussion of state-level policy of child custody following divorce. As welfare costs increase and governments look for ways to cut spending, observers expect continuing policy emphasis on establishing paternity and child support enforcement programs. As of January 1, 1994, new court-ordered child support payments will be collected through wage withholding for the noncustodial parents of all children, whether or not they are receiving welfare benefits. There is mixed evidence on the effects of mandatory wage withholding, some suggesting that it increases child support collections and some suggesting that it acts as a disincentive to some fathers for employment. The effects of the new federal requirement remain to be seen.

Even when child support is paid, the levels of support are very low. Noncustodial fathers contribute only 19 percent, on average, of their children's household income. Furthermore, many awards are not adjusted over time. Participants discussed the benefits of more uniform standards for child support and for minimum assured child support benefits, on one hand, and for

more flexibility to allow nonmonetary supplements to financial support, on the other. Programs such as Parents' Fair Share that provide job training, peer group counseling, mediation, and on-going support after employment may help increase poor fathers' ability and desire to provide support for their children.

Directions for Research

Thirty years' of active research has advanced understanding of the contributions that fathers make to the lives of their children and elucidated the wide variability that characterizes how fathers perceive and fulfill their roles in families. However, any effort to gain a full picture of fathering functions and their implications for children's development and for policy is hindered by several features of this research:

- Research on fathering is fragmented, with separate strands of inquiry focusing on the effects of quality of father involvement in intact/father-present families, on the economic and psychological ramifications of father absence, and, most recently, on fathers who have primary or sole custody of their children.
- Much of the research on fathers has suffered from the absence of a clear conceptualization of fathering roles, as distinct from the standard of mothering roles.
- Minimal attention has been paid to the context within which fathers fulfill or fail to fulfill their responsibilities towards their families. Research, as a result, has little to offer towards the understanding of the factors within families, communities, social institutions, workplaces, and the broader economy and culture that support or undermine fathering for different groups in differing circumstances.
- Research has failed to address several of the most compelling policy issues that bear on fathering. Indeed, beyond child support enforcement,

there is little consensus about the range of policy questions that bear directly on fathering and so need to be considered in terms of their effects on fathers and fathering.

These shortcomings provided a departure point for the participants' discussion of promising directions for the next generation of research on fathers and fathering. The discussions clustered around the importance of four factors: (1) adopting a life-span perspective on fathering, (2) approaching fathering as a negotiated role, (3) considering the community context of fathering, and (4) contributing to the development of innovative programs and policies for fathers.

Fathers have been studied primarily as they affect their children's development, with minimal attention paid to the place of fathering in men's own lives. In this context, the increasing variation in the timing of men's becoming fathers may hold significant implications for their interest and ability to be highly engaged with their children. Many men first become fathers soon after they marry and at the same time that they are launching careers. Increasingly, however, men are becoming fathers before or long after they first become husbands and workers, sometimes in the context of a second (or subsequent) marriage. Research that examines the influence of the timing of fatherhood in the trajectory of men's lives and in the context of other roles that men fulfill was suggested by the workshop participants as a very worthwhile direction for future study, as suggested by some early work along these lines.

Preliminary evidence from longitudinal research suggests that high levels of engagement in fathering benefits not only children, but also affects fathers' later roles (Snarey, 1993). For example, men at midlife who reported that they were currently involved in mentoring younger adults in their workplaces and neighborhoods were more likely than less involved men to report that they had been very involved in fathering during their own children's childhood and adolescent years. Perhaps fathering stimulates subsequent social involvement and nurturing of younger generations.

It was also suggested that assuming the role of father may offer a powerful source of motivation for some men to also assume constructive and enduring commitments to occupational and marital roles. Studies aimed at elucidating the effects of fathering on male development hold the potential to expand notions of why people should care, as a society, about men's engagement as fathers. Research in this area may also provide important clues regarding the aspects of fathering that men find most rewarding and that, in turn, may suggest important ways to promote their involvement with their children.

The intersection between men's occupational status and their fathering roles was noted frequently at the workshop, primarily in the context of the

negative effects of unemployment on fathering. Research examining evidence that dates back to the Great Depression has documented the profound negative impact that the absence of work has on men's interactions with their children (Elder and Caspi, 1988). Researchers have recently begun to examine how the conditions and characteristics of work affect fathering on behalf of employed fathers (Greenberger and O'Neil, 1991; O'Neil, 1991; Repetti, 1989; Repetti, 1994). Further understanding of the dimensions of work that affect fathering could provide important guidance for workplace interventions aimed at alleviating the pressures that can spill over into negative father-child interactions. One participant called specifically for research into corporate practices that contribute to "father friendly" work environments.

Fathers' roles will only be fully appreciated to the extent that their own development is examined in concert with the development of their wives and their children. The intersection of fathering and mothering was a particularly prominent topic of discussion. The amount and nature of fathering that children receive was portrayed by the workshop participants as a product of the interplay between men's and women's roles in families. Men do not just assume the role of father; they negotiate it, either in partnership or in conflict with their children's mothers.

Much remains to be understood about how mothers and fathers negotiate their respective roles as parents. How does the quality of the relationship between mother and father affect fathers' engagement with their children? What implicit and explicit roles are played by other family members in this process? What perceptions and experiences shape mothers' attitudes about the competence and reliability of fathers and fathers' attitudes about their roles? The participants agreed that fathering cannot be adequately understood apart from family systems, from prevailing attitudes about gender roles, and, in effect, from mothering.

The special case of families with a disabled child was also discussed as an area of research that would benefit from approaching mothers and fathers as partners in child rearing. Research on these families has neglected fathers' roles and placed mothers at the center of concern. As a consequence, virtually nothing is known about fathers' relationships with disabled children. How do fathers view their role in the care of a disabled child? What individual and contextual factors contribute to more or less close emotional attachments between fathers and their disabled children? What kinds of assistance from formal and informal sources would fathers find most helpful? Although some of these questions are being studied, mothers are typically the sole data source. Direct interviews with fathers may reveal major differences between a mother's perception of the father's role and the father's outlook on what he should be doing.

The discussion of the role of "old heads" in inner-city communities

raised a number of questions about the community context within which fathering roles are defined, transmitted, and either supported or undermined. It has long been understood that fathering is a role that is passed from one generation to the next. The mechanisms through which this intergenerational transmission occurs, however, are not well understood. The workshop discussion revealed the importance of the social organization of communities for this process of mentoring fathers and raised many questions about sources of fathering images for today's young men.

How, for example, are community norms about "good fathering" established and communicated? Children who are reared in father absent households often grow up without models of fathering, yet this aspect of fathers' absences has been neglected in the empirical emphasis on the economic and more immediate losses that children experience in these situations. It is for these children that salient community norms and non-parental male role models are likely to be particularly important. And in two-parent families, how does the degree of cooperation that parents demonstrate in child rearing affect children's subsequent ability as adults to form strong spousal ties and to function well as coparents?

More generally, the role of social context as a source of variation in how fathers view their role in the family, in how they behave, and in the nature of the contributions that they make to their families is richly deserving of study. Why do some fathers in intact families become highly engaged with their children while others spend the vast majority of their time away from their children? Why do some divorced fathers feel a continuing responsibility for their offspring, while others seem to divorce their whole family? Why do some men living in impoverished environments remain committed to and involved with their families, while others succumb to the pressures that push men away from their families? What are the implications of answers to these questions for the construction of policies that will encourage rather than hinder fathers' sustained involvement with their children?

The lack of knowledge about programs that foster fathers' sustained and active involvement with their children was noted throughout the workshop. A central tension concerned the benefits of approaches that emphasize men's role as workers and focus on employment opportunities, compared with those that emphasize more motivational dimensions of fathering and focus on fostering men's confidence and commitment to the fathering role. One participant suggested that men be asked directly about the factors that have helped or hindered their involvement with their children and that this information be used to design "father-driven" interventions.

The need for much more systematic evaluation research on policies pertaining to divorce, child support, and custodial arrangements was also discussed. What practices, for example, promote the effective establish-

ment of paternity for different groups? Sonenstein's work indicates the importance of offering fathers the opportunity to acknowledge paternity in the context of swift enforcement for noncompliance (Sonenstein et al., 1993), yet the direction of policy is towards mandatory mechanisms. Particularly needed is research that moves beyond documenting low rates of establishing and enforcing child support orders and aims to elucidate the economic and noneconomic deterrents to an effective child support policy. The workshop participants were also interested in seeing more research on the use of mediation and its ramifications for postdivorce relations among mothers, fathers, and their children. A general observation concerned the focus of public policy on men's economic contributions to their families, rather than assessments of fathers' behavior towards their children in evaluations of policies governing paternity establishment, custodial arrangements, and child support enforcement.

In sum, multiple avenues for research on fatherhood were suggested by the workshop participants, ranging from foundational research on the influence of fathering on fathers to evaluation research aimed at explaining effective approaches to supporting fathers' engagement with their children. The common theme of the discussion was that it is only when fathers are studied in the context of their own development and the context of their families, communities, and jobs that a full appreciation of the factors that influence their self-perceptions, behaviors, and level of engagement as fathers can be gained.

References and Bibliography

- Anderson, E.
 1992a *Street Wise: Race, Class, and Change in an Urban Community*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
 1992b The story of John Turner. *The Public Interest* 108(Summer):3-34.
- Bane, M. J., and P. A. Jargowsky
 1988 The links between government policy and family structure: What matters and what doesn't. In *The Changing American Family and Public Policy*, A. J. Cherlin, ed. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.
- Barnett, R., and G. Baruch
 1987 Determinants of fathers' participation in family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 49:29-40.
- Beitel, A., and R. D. Parke
 1993 Maternal Attitudes as a Determinant of Father Involvement. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, University of California, Riverside.
- Belsky, J.
 1979 Mother-father-infant interaction: A naturalistic observational study. *Developmental Psychology* 15:601-607.
- Belsky, J., B. Gilstrap, and M. Rovine
 1984 The Pennsylvania infant and family development project: Stability and change in mother-infant and father-infant interaction in a family setting at one, three, and nine months. *Child Development* 55:692-705.
- Bloom, D., and K. Sherwood
 1994 *The Parents' Fair Share Demonstration: Report on the Pilot Phase*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.
- Bristol, M. M., J. J. Gallagher, and E. Schopler
 1988 Mothers and fathers of young developmentally disabled and nondisabled boys: Adaptation and spousal support. *Developmental Psychology* 24(3):441-451.

- Bronstein, P.
1988 Father-child interaction: Implications for gender-role socialization. In *Fatherhood Today: Men's Changing Role in the Family*, P. Bronstein and C. P. Cowan, eds. New York: Wiley.
- Buchanan, C. M., E. E. Maccoby, and S. M. Dornbusch
1992 Adolescents and their families after divorce: Three residential arrangements compared. *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 2(3):261-291.
1991 Caught between parents: Adolescents' experience in divorced homes. *Child Development* 62(5):1008-1029.
- Bureau of the Census
1991 *Child Support and Alimony: 1989*. Current Population Report, Series P-60, no. 173. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce.
1993 *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1993*. 113th edition. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives
1992 *1992 Green Book: Overview of Entitlement Programs*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Congressional Research Service, U.S. Library of Congress
1993a Child Support Assurance: United States Initiatives and Experience in Other Countries by C. Solomon and L. Hierholzer. CRS Report 93-167, February 4.
1993b The Child Support Enforcement Program: A Fact Sheet by C. Solomon. CRS Report 93-4 EPW, January 6.
1993c Time-Limited Welfare Proposals by V. Burke. CRS Issue Brief IB93034, August 23.
- Cowan, C. P., and P. A. Cowan
1992 *When Partners Become Parents*. New York: Basic Books.
- Davis, P. B., and J. E. May
1991 Involving fathers in early intervention and family support programs: Issues and strategies. *Children's Health Care* 20(2):87-92.
- Duncan, G. J., and S. D. Hoffman
1985 A reconsideration of the economic consequences of divorce. *Demography* 22:485-497.
- Elder, G. H., Jr., and A. Caspi
1988 Economic stress in lives: Developmental perspectives. *Journal of Social Issues* 44(4):25-45.
- Elder, G. H., Jr., A. Caspi, and T. Van Nguyen
1986 Resourceful and vulnerable children: Family influence in hard times. In *Development as Action in Context*, R. K. Silbereisen et al., eds. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Essex, E. L., M. M. Seltzer, and M. W. Krauss
1993 Aging Fathers as Caregivers for Adult Children with Developmental Disabilities. Paper presented at the National Institute on Aging seminar, Men's Caregiving Roles in and Aging Society, Rockville, Maryland, April 19-20. Available from M. W. Krauss, Heller Graduate School, Brandeis University.
- Farber, B.
1986 Historical contexts of research on families with mentally retarded members. In *Families of Handicapped Persons*, J. Gallagher and Vietze, eds. Baltimore: Brooks Publishing.
- Feldman, S. S., and T. M. Gehring
1988 Changing perceptions of family cohesion and power across adolescence. *Child Development* 59:1034-1045.

- Fineman, M. L.
 1988 Dominant discourse, professional language, and legal change in child custody decisionmaking. *Harvard Law Review* 101(4):727-774.
 1989 The politics of custody and the transformation of American custody decision making. *U.C. Davis Law Review* 22(3):829-864.
 1992 The neutered mother. *University of Miami Law Review* 42(3):653-669.
- Fineman, M. L., and A. Opie
 1987 The uses of social science data in legal policymaking: Custody determinations at divorce. *Wisconsin Law Review* 1987(1):107-158.
- Furstenberg, F. F.
 1988 Good dads—bad dads: Two faces of fatherhood. In *The Changing American Family and Public Policy*, A. J. Cherlin, ed. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.
- Furstenberg, F. F., K. E. Sherwood, and M. L. Sullivan
 1992 *Caring and Paying: What Fathers and Mothers Say About Child Support*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.
- Gallagher, J. J., W. Scharfman, M. Bristol
 1984 The division of responsibilities in families with preschool handicapped and nonhandicapped children. *Journal of the Division for Early Childhood* 8:3-11.
- Garfinkel, I.
 1992 *Assuring Child Support*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Garfinkel, I., and S. S. McLanahan
 1986 *Single Mothers and Their Children: A New American Dilemma*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.
- Garfinkel, I., D. R. Meyer, and G. D. Sandefur
 1992 *The Effects of Alternative Child Support Systems on Blacks, Hispanics, and Non-Hispanic Whites*. IRP reprint no. 672. Madison, Wisc.: Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin.
- Gaylin, W.
 1992 *The Male Ego*. New York: Viking.
- Gerson, K.
 1993 *No Man's Land: Men's Changing Commitments to Family and Work*. New York: Basic Books.
 1994 A few good men: Overcoming the barriers to involved fatherhood. *The American Prospect* 16(Winter):78-90.
- Greenberger, E., and R. O'Neil
 1991 Characteristics of Fathers' and Mothers' Jobs: Implications for Parenting and Children's Social Development. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Seattle, Washington, April. School of Social Ecology, University of California, Irvine.
- Grossman, F. K., W. S. Pollack, and E. Golding
 1988 Fathers and children: Predicting the quality and quantity of fathering. *Developmental Psychology* 24:82-91.
- Hareven, T. K.
 1981 American families in transition: Historical perspectives on change. In *Normal Families in Social Cultural Context*, F. Walsh, ed. New York: Guilford Press.
 1988 Historical changes in children's support networks. In *Children's Social Supports*, D. Belle, ed. New York: John Wiley Publishers.
 1990 A complex relationship: Family strategies and the processes of economic and social change. In *Beyond the Marketplace*, R. Friedland and A. F. Robertson, eds. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

- Hareven, T. K., ed.
1978 *Transitions: The Family and the Life Course in Historical Perspective*. New York: Academic Press.
- Hareven, T. K., and A. Plakans, eds.
1988 *Family History at the Crossroads*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Hawkins, A. J.
1992 Critical components or peripheral parts? Fathers in and out of families. *Family Perspectives* 26(2):171-190.
- Hawkins, A. J., S. L. Christiansen, K. P. Sargent, and E. J. Hill
1993 Rethinking fathers' involvement in child care: A developmental perspective. *Journal of Family Issues* 14(4):532-550.
- Hernandez, D. J.
1993 *America's Children: Resources From Family, Government, and Economy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hochschild, A., and A. Machung
1990 *Second Shift*. New York: Avon.
- Hoffman, S. D., G. J. Duncan, and R. Mincy
1992 Do Labor Market, Welfare and Neighborhood Conditions Account for Declining Rates of Marriage among Black and White Women? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Economics Association, January 1992. Available from the Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Johnson, D.
1993 More and more, the single parent is dad. *The New York Times* August 31:A1, A15.
- Johnston, J. R., L. E. G. Campbell, and S. Mayes
1985 Latency children in post-separation and divorce disputes. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry* 24:563-574.
- Kimmel, M.
1993 What do men want? *Harvard Business Review* 71(6):50.
- Krauss, M. W.
1993 Child-related and parenting stress: Similarities and differences between mothers and fathers of children with disabilities. *American Journal of Mental Retardation* 97(4):393-404.
- Lamb, M. E.
1977 Father-infant and mother-infant interaction in the first year of life. *Child Development* 48:167-181.
- Lamb, M. E., C. Hwang, A. Broberg, F. Brookstein, et al.
1988 The determinants of parental involvement in primiparous Swedish families. *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 11(4):33-449.
- Lerman, R. I.
1993 Unwed fathers: Who are they? *The American Enterprise* 4(5):32-35.
- Lerman, R. I., and T. J. Ooms
1993 Unwed fathers: Complex dilemmas for policy-makers. *The American Enterprise* 4(5):27-31,36-37.
- Levine, J. A.
1993 Involving fathers in Head Start: A framework for public policy and program development. *Families in Society* 74(1):4-19.
- Maccoby, E. E., and R. H. Mnookin with C. E. Depner and H. E. Peters
1992 *Dividing the Child: Social and Legal Dilemmas of Custody*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Marsiglio, W.
1987 Adolescent fathers in the United States: Their initial living arrangements, marital experience and educational outcomes. *Family Planning Perspectives* 19:240-251.

- 1993a Adolescent males' orientation toward paternity and contraception. *Family Planning Perspectives* 25:22-31.
- 1993b Contemporary scholarship on fatherhood: Culture, identity, and conduct. *Journal of Family Issues* 14(4):484-509.
- 1993c Fathers' Diverse Life Course Patterns and Roles: Implications for Public Policy. Paper presented at the National Research Council workshop, America's Fathers, Washington, D.C., September 27, 1993. Department of Sociology, University of Florida.
- In press Young nonresident biological fathers. *Marriage and Family Review*.
- May, J.
- 1991 *Fathers of Children With Special Needs: New Horizons*. Bethesda, Md.: Association for the Care of Children's Health.
- 1992 *Circles of Care and Understanding: Support Programs for Fathers of Children with Special Needs*. Bethesda, Md.: Association for the Care of Children's Health.
- McAdoo, J. L.
- 1988 Changing perspectives on the role of the Black father. In *Fatherhood Today: Men's Changing Role in the Family*, P. Bronstein and C. P. Cowan, eds. New York: John Wiley.
- 1990 Understanding African-American teen fathers. In *Understanding Troubled and Troubling Youth*, P. E. Leone, ed. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, Inc.
- 1993a The roles of African American fathers: An ecological perspective. *Families in Society: A Journal of Contemporary Human Services* 74(1):28-34.
- 1993b Understanding fathers: Human services perspectives in theory and practice. *Family Resource Coalition Report* 12(1):18-20.
- National Research Council
- 1987 *Risking the Future: Adolescent Sexuality, Pregnancy, and Childbearing*. Panel on Adolescent Pregnancy and Childbearing, Committee on Child Development Research and Public Policy, National Research Council. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- 1993 *Losing Generations: Adolescents in High Risk Settings*. Panel on High-Risk Youth, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Nixon, G. R., and A. E. O. King
- 1993 Former client outcome survey (1984-1992): Phase III evaluation. Cleveland, Ohio: National Institute for Responsible Fatherhood and Family Development.
- Nock, S. L., and P. W. Kingston
- 1988 Time with children: The impact of couples' work-time commitments. *Social Forces* 67(1):59-85.
- O'Connell, M.
- 1993 *Where's Poppa?: Fathers' Role in Child Care*. Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau, Inc.
- O'Neil, R.
- 1991 Fathers' Work Experiences and Well-Being: Implications for Parenting and Children's Achievement. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Seattle, Washington, April. Department of Psychology, University of California, Riverside.
- Parke, R. D.
- 1990 In search of fathers: A narrative of an empirical journey. In *Methods of Family Research*, Vol. 1, I. Sigel and G. Brody, eds. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Peters, H. E., L. M. Argys, E. E. Maccoby, and R. H. Mnookin
- 1993 Enforcing divorce settlements: Evidence from child support compliance and award modifications. *Demography* 30(4):719-735.

- Pirog-Good, M. A.
1992 Teen fathers and the child support enforcement system. In *Paternity Establishment: A Public Policy Conference. Vol. II: Studies of the Circumstances of Mothers and Fathers*. SR #56B. Madison, Wisc.: Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin.
1993 In-kind contributions as child support: The teen alternative parenting program. In *Young Unwed Fathers: Changing Roles and Emerging Policies*, R. I. Lerman and T. J. Ooms, eds. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Pirog-Good, M. A., and D. H. Good
1993 Child support enforcement for teenage fathers: Problems and Prospects. Resubmitted with requested revisions to the *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. Available from M. A. Pirog-Good, School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University.
- Pleck, J. H.
1985 *Working Wives/Working Husbands*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Presser, H. B.
1988 Shift work and child care among young American parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 50:133-148.
- Repetti, R. L.
1989 Effects of daily workload on subsequent behavior during marital interaction: The roles of social withdrawal and spouse support. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 57(4):651-659.
1994 Short-term and long-term processes linking job stressors to father-child interaction. *Social Development* 3(1):1-15.
- Robinson, J. P.
1989 Caring for kids. *American Demographics* 11(7):52.
- Ross, H. L., and L. Y. Sawhill
1975 *Time of Transition: The Growth of Families Headed by Women*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.
- Russell, G., and A. Russell
1987 Mother-child and father-child relationships in middle childhood. *Child Development* 58:1573-1585.
- Seltzer, J. A.
1990 Legal and physical custody arrangements in recent divorces. *Social Science Quarterly* 71:250-266.
1991a Legal custody arrangements and children's economic welfare. *American Journal of Sociology* 96(4):895-929.
1991b Relationships between fathers and children who live apart: The father's role after separation. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53(1):79-101.
1992 Custody and visiting after divorce: The other side of child support. In *Child Support Assurance: Design Issues, Expected Impacts, and Political Barriers as Seen From Wisconsin*, I. Garfinkel, S. S. McLanahan, and P. K. Robins, eds. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.
1993 Consequences of marital dissolution for children. Prepared for *Annual Review of Sociology* 20(September).
- Seltzer, J. A., and S. M. Bianchi
1988 Children's contact with absent parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 50:666-678.
- Seltzer, J. A., N. C. Schaeffer, and H-W. Charng
1989 Family ties after divorce: The relationship between visiting and paying child support. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 51:1013-1032.

- Singer, J. B., and W. L. Reynolds
1988 A dissent on joint custody. *Maryland Law Review* 47:497-523.
- Snarey, J.
1993 *How Fathers Care for the Next Generation*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Sonenstein, F. L.
1993 Linking children to their fathers. *The Urban Institute Policy and Research Report* (Summer):24.
- Sonenstein, F. L., and C. A. Calhoun
1990 Determinants of child support: A pilot survey of absent parents. *Contemporary Policy Issues* 8(January):75-94.
- Sonenstein, F. L., J. Pleck, and L. Ku
1992 Cost and Opportunity Factors Associated with Pregnancy Risk Among Adolescent Males. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, April 30, 1992. Available from F. L. Sonenstein, The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Sonenstein, F. L., P. A. Holcomb, and K. S. Seefeldt
1993 Promising Approaches to Improving Paternity Establishment Rates at the Local Level. Available from F. L. Sonenstein, The Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.
- Sullivan, M. L.
1985 *Teen Fathers in the Inner City: An Exploratory Ethnographic Study*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.
1992 Noncustodial fathers' attitudes and behaviors. In *Caring and Paying: What Fathers and Mothers Say About Child Support*, F. F. Furstenberg, K. E. Sherwood, and M. L. Sullivan, eds. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.
- Turnbull, A., V. Turbiville, H. R. Turnbull, and G. Gabbard
1993 Fathers as "Less Apparent" in Early Childhood Special Education Research and Service Delivery. Paper presented at the National Research Council workshop on America's fathers, Washington, D.C., September 26-28, 1993. Beach Center on Families and Disability, University of Kansas.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
1993 *Child Support Enforcement: 16th Annual Report to Congress*. Report No. DHHS (ACF) 93-33001. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- U.S. General Accounting Office
1993 *Child Support Assurance: Effect of Applying State Guidelines to Determine Fathers' Payments*. Report No. GAO/HRD-93-26. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Watson, B. H.
1992 *Young Unwed Fathers Pilot Project: Initial Implementation Report*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Public/Private Ventures.
- Wattenberg, E.
1987 Establishing paternity for nonmarital children. *Public Welfare* (Summer):9-13.
- Weitzman, L. J.
1985 *The Divorce Revolution: The Unexpected Social and Economic Consequences for Women and Children in America*. New York: Free Press.
- Wilson, W. J.
1987 *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

APPENDIX

Workshop Agenda
America's Fathers:
Abiding and Emerging Roles, in Family
and Economic Support Policies

National Academy of Sciences
2101 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC

September 26-28, 1993

September 26

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 5:30-6:00p | Reception |
| 6:00-7:00p | Dinner |
| 7:00-7:15p | Welcome, Introductions, Opening Remarks
Donald Wertlieb |
| 7:15-7:45p | Fathers' Engagement in Family and Economic Support
Programs: Opportunities and Challenges
Thomas Downey |
| 7:45-8:00p | Question and Answer Session |
| 8:00-8:30p | Historical Changes in the Role of Fathers in the U.S.
Tamara Hareven |
| 8:30-9:00p | Question and Answer Session / Discussion |

September 27

- 8:15-9:00a Continental Breakfast
- 9:00-9:15a Introductory Remarks
- 9:15-9:45a The Diversity of Fathers' Roles Throughout the Life Course:
Implications for Public Policy
William Marsiglio
- 9:45-10:15a Impact of Different Cultural Attitudes on the
Role of Fathers
Richard Majors
- 10:15-10:45a Psychological Aspects of Fatherhood
Ross Parke
- 10:45-11:00a Break
- 11:15a-noon Discussion
- noon-1:30p Lunch
- 1:30-3:00p Fathers' Roles in Intervention Programs for Children at
Special Risk: Disabled, Chronically Ill, and Children
Living in Poverty
Panel presentations (60 min) followed by
discussion (30 min)
James Gallagher, Martha Krauss, Ann Turnbull
- 3:00-3:15p Break
- 3:15-4:45p Fathers' Roles in Economic Support Programs:
Divorce, Child Support, and Welfare Reform
Panel presentations (60 min) followed by
discussion (30 min)
Irwin Garfinkel, Ron Haskins, Judith Seltzer
- 4:45-5:00p Wrap-up discussion
- 6:00-7:30p Dinner
- 7:30-9:00p Panel—Fathers' Rights
Robert Mnookin, Martha Fineman, Robert Levy
Discussion

September 28

8:15-9:00a Continental Breakfast

9:00-10:30a Fathers' Roles in Teenage Parenting Programs
Panel presentations (60 min) followed by
discussion (30 min)

Elijah Anderson, Charles Ballard, Darryl Ward

10:30a-noon Synthesis discussion: What do we know about factors that facilitate vs. hinder fathers' involvement in family and economic support programs? How is our answer to this question informed/shaped by historical, cultural, psychological, and lifespan perspectives? Are there mismatches between this knowledge base and assumptions presently embedded in public policies? Where is more research needed?

Noon-1:30p Lunch

1:30p Adjourn

NATIONAL ACADEMY PRESS

The National Academy Press was created by the National Academy of Sciences to publish the reports issued by the Academy, and by the National Academy of Engineering, the Institute of Medicine, and the National Research Council. It operates under the charter granted to the National Academy of Sciences by the Congress of the United States.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

60